

Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested. Applicants submit this amendment places the application in even better condition for allowance or appeal. No new issues requiring further consideration or search are raised. Accordingly, entry is respectfully allowed.

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1-10 are pending in the application, with claims 1 and 6 being the independent claims. Claims 1 and 6 are sought to be amended. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 4 and 5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abbott et al. (US Patent No. 4,328,577) (Abbot) in view of Sebaa et al. (WESCON/94. 'Idea/Microelectronics' Conference) (Sebaa) and Gajjar (US Patent No. 5,787,463). Claim 2 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abbott in view of Sebaa and Gajjar, as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Mann et al. (US Patent Application Publication 2001/0013104) (Mann). Claims 6-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aagaard et al. (US

Patent No 3,928,730) (Aagard) in view of Abbott, Sebaa and Gajjar. Reconsideration of claims 1- 9 is respectfully requested.

Applicants respectfully submit that the various combined teachings of Abbott, Sebaa, Mann, Aagaard and Gajjar fail to teach or suggest the claimed invention. For example, claims 1 and 6 recite, in part, "wherein a CRC module is configured to receive testing output data directly from the one testing output data-path and to perform uninterrupted CRC testing of the video testing output data." (See Figures 1 and 2). Neither Abbot, Sebaa, Gajjar or Mann, alone or in combination, teach the features of claims 1 and 6.

Furthermore, paragraph 6 of the Office Action states, "However, while other functions are disclosed, Gajjar discloses that the hardware is dedicated to CRC testing at least at one point, so avoiding the delay of other functions at least at the time the hardware is dedicated to CRC testing would have been desirable to one of ordinary skill in the art." Applicants respectfully disagree. These other operations of Gajjar's RAID processor would interrupt the CRC video output data testing so as to make the testing ineffective. The device would likely be inoperable for CRC testing of the video testing output data because the video output data that is output through the one testing output data path would be intermittingly tested by the CRC module because the RAID processor of Gajjar would be performing other functions while video data was flowing through the testing output data-path. Accordingly Gajjar cannot be combined with Abbott, Sebaa, Mann, Aagaard to teach or suggest the features of claims 1 and 6.

Claims 2-5 depend from claim 1 and claims 7-9 depend from claim 6. Therefore, claims 2-5 and 7-9 are allowable at least for the reasons claims 1 and 6 are allowable, and for the specific features recited therein.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1-9 is requested.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Office Action indicated that claim 10 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants, however, choose not to rewrite claim 10 at this time.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



Theodore A. Wood
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 52,374

Date: 29 Aug 08

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600

TAW/PPH/jmh
839956_1.DOC